

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress  
1st Session

Vote No. 393

August 11, 1995, 9:28 a.m.  
Page S-12320 Temp. Record

## DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS/Trident II Missile

**SUBJECT:** Department of Defense Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996 . . . S. 1087. Stevens motion to table the Bumpers amendment No. 2398.

### ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 67-31

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported, S. 1987, the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996, will appropriate \$242.7 billion for the military functions of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1996, which is \$6.4 billion more than requested and \$2.3 billion less than the fiscal year (FY) 1995 funding level.

**The Bumpers amendment** would cut funding by \$150 million and would add that no funds will be expended to backfit any Trident I submarines to carry D-5 Trident II missiles.

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. Following debate, Senator Stevens moved to table the Bumpers amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

**Those favoring** the motion to table contended:

We salute our dear colleague from Arkansas for the passion with which he makes his arguments and we inform him that he is wrong. His contention is that replacing C-4 missiles with D-5 missiles is a waste of money. It is only a waste of money if one does not believe that it is necessary to maintain our strategic submarine force, which is the safest, and therefore the strongest, leg of the United States' nuclear triad of bombers, submarines, and land-based missiles.

As our colleagues have noted, we have 18 Trident submarines, 10 of which are armed with D-5 missiles and 8 of which are armed with C-4 missiles. The Navy, in accordance with last year's comprehensive Nuclear Posture Review (which was approved by President Clinton) plans on retrofitting with D-5 missiles 4 of the submarines that now carry C-4 missiles, and taking the other 4 submarines with C-4 missiles out of service. From this point, though, our colleagues have erred. They tell us that the C-4 missiles will last for the service lives of the submarines. They are wrong. According to a letter we received today from the Secretary of the

(See other side)

YEAS (67)			NAYS (31)		NOT VOTING (2)	
Republicans (49 or 92%)	Democrats (18 or 40%)		Republicans (4 or 8%)	Democrats (27 or 60%)	Republicans (1)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Helms	Biden	Grassley	Akaka	Simpson <sup>-2</sup>	Bradley <sup>-4</sup>
Ashcroft	Hutchison	Bingaman	Hatfield	Baucus		
Bennett	Inhofe	Bryan	Jeffords	Boxer		
Bond	Kassebaum	Dodd	Snowe	Breaux		
Brown	Kempthorne	Exon		Bumpers		
Burns	Kyl	Feinstein		Byrd		
Campbell	Lott	Ford		Conrad		
Chafee	Lugar	Glenn		Daschle		
Coats	Mack	Graham		Dorgan		
Cochran	McCain	Heflin		Feingold		
Cohen	McConnell	Hollings		Harkin		
Coverdell	Murkowski	Inouye		Kerrey		
Craig	Nickles	Johnston		Kerry		
D'Amato	Packwood	Kennedy		Kohl		
DeWine	Pressler	Lieberman		Lautenberg		
Dole	Roth	Mikulski		Leahy		
Domenici	Santorum	Nunn		Levin		
Faircloth	Shelby	Robb		Moseley-Braun		
Frist	Smith			Moynihan		
Gorton	Specter			Murray		
Gramm	Stevens			Pell		
Grams	Thomas			Pryor		
Gregg	Thompson			Reid		
Hatch	Thurmond			Rockefeller		
	Warner			Sarbanes		
				Simon		
				Wellstone		

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Buisiness  
2—Necessarily Absent  
3—Illness  
4—Other

#### SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea  
AN—Announced Nay  
PY—Paired Yea  
PN—Paired Nay

Navy: "Even with an aggressive and expensive sustainment program, the C-4 cannot be expected to last the projected life of the submarines which carry them. Therefore, the C-4 will require substantial and costly life extension efforts or replacement by another missile. The most sensible and cost-effective approach to this issue is to continue procurement of D-5 missiles and continue planning for backfit for four submarines." Our colleagues next tell us that the Bumpers amendment would save \$150 million this year and \$4.5 billion over the next several years. They are wrong. For this year, the amendment would cost \$100 million, because the \$150 million savings from not buying the missiles would be exceeded by the \$250 million in costs from breaking the contract and shutting down the production line. In future years, as noted above, the Navy would have to spend enormous sums to maintain the C-4 (which has been out of production since 1987) that would cost more than maintaining the D-5 missile, and would very likely have to buy new missiles anyway. The only alternative might end up being to not have any missiles on those submarines, which would rather defeat their purpose.

The next fact that our colleagues have gotten wrong is that they believe there is little difference between the D-5 and C-4 missiles. Again, according to the Secretary of the Navy, the D-5 missile "has greater range, better reliability, much improved accuracy and most importantly, twice the design life of its predecessor the C-4 . . ." Our colleagues have said that the sole difference between the two is that the D-5 is accurate to within 150 yards and the C-4 is accurate to within 300 yards, and they have said that this difference is meaningless. However, this distinction is significant, because it can often mean the difference in whether or not a hardened target is destroyed. Further, it is interesting that our colleagues have mentioned this as the only difference, though the Secretary of the Navy has listed several advantages to the D-5 missile.

The truth is that the cheapest way to maintain our strategic nuclear submarine fleet is with this retrofitting program, and it also will make our fleet more effective. The only way our colleagues' position would make any sense is if we knew we were definitely going to shrink our submarine fleet even further. That reduction may be negotiated. However, if we shrink our fleet, or make it obvious we are going to shrink our fleet, in advance of negotiations, Russia will have little incentive to follow suit. We cannot fold and then expect Russia to fold too.

Relations with Russia are good right now. They may not be in the future. Russia still has immense nuclear capabilities. We will not disarm our Nation while those capabilities still exist. The most efficient and effective way we can maintain our submarine leg of our nuclear triad is by replacing existing C-4 missiles with D-5 missiles. The Bumpers amendment would kill this sensible program for supposed savings of \$4.5 billion that would never materialize. We therefore urge our colleagues to join us in tabling the Bumpers amendment.

**Those opposing the motion to table contended:**

The United States has 10 Trident subs with D-5 missiles, and 8 Trident subs with C-4 missiles. Four of those C-4 submarines are about to be retired, and the remaining four will be retrofitted with D-5 missiles for the astronomical sum of \$4.5 billion. This retrofit is absolutely asinine. The difference between these missiles, both of which fly over 4,000 miles, is that the C-4 can hit within 300 yards of its target and the D-5 missile can hit within 150 yards. Considering that they are carrying 100-kiloton warheads that will blow up everything for miles around, this difference does not make any difference at all. The submarines that are going to be retrofitted are scheduled to be retired in 2016. On November 9, 1992, Martin Meth of the DoD Weapon Support Improvement Group said, "There are no obvious life limiting modes or logistics barriers to extending the service life of the currently deployed C-4 missiles to the year 2016." Thus, these C-4 missiles can last as long as the submarines they are on. Why should we buy new missiles that will cost \$4.5 billion to replace missiles that are going to last as long as the submarines they are on? All we will get is a missile that can hit 150 yards closer to dead center of the several square mile area it is going to blow up.

The most depressing part of this whole plan is that we know we cannot stop it. Our country has a \$4.5 trillion debt, and our colleagues almost seem to relish cutting education, the arts, public broadcasting, and any other social spending, but they will not cut defense. They are intent on spending billions of dollars more than even the Defense Department says it needs. Most Members cannot wait to spend billions of dollars on anything that explodes, but they will not spend 10 cents more on things that really matter like welfare, education, and the arts. Someday our colleagues will realize that it is important to invest more in people than in bombs. Today, we are certain they will defeat this amendment.